

REMARKS

The May 5, 2004 Office Action has been carefully considered; and the claim amendments above and the comments that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to address all issues raised in that Action. Prompt favorable reconsideration of this application is solicited.

It is noted with appreciation that the Examiner indicated that claims 17, 23 and 28 would be allowable if recast in independent claim form.

The limitations of claim 17 have been moved up into independent claim 16. As a result, claim 16 now corresponds to claim 17 recast in independent form. An additional clarifying amendment has been made to the last paragraph of claim 16, however, it is believed that this additional change is not substantive and it should not narrow the scope of the last paragraph of the claim. Claim 16 should be allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Claims 18-21 depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 16 (corresponding former claim 17). Claims 18 and 19 have been amended, but only to delete multiple dependency from the cancelled dependent version of claim 17. Claims 18-21 should be allowable together with allowable independent claim 16.

Similarly, the limitations of claim 23 have been moved up into independent claim 22. As a result, claim 22 now corresponds to claim 23 recast in independent form. An additional clarifying amendment has been made to the last paragraph of claim 22, however, it is believed that this additional change is not substantive and it should not narrow the scope of the last paragraph of the claim. Claim 22 should be allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Claims 24-26 depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 22 (corresponding to former claim 23). Claims 24 and 25 have been amended, but only to delete multiple dependency from the cancelled dependent version of claim 23. Claims 24-26 should be allowable together with allowable independent claim 22.

Similarly, the limitations of claim 28 have been moved up into independent claim 27. As a result, claim 27 now corresponds to claim 28 recast in independent form. An additional clarifying

amendment has been made to the last paragraph of claim 27, however, it is believed that this additional change is not substantive and it should not narrow the scope of the last paragraph of the claim. Claim 27 should be allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Claims 29-31 depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 27 (corresponding to former claim 28). Claims 29 and 30 have been amended, but only to delete multiple dependency from the cancelled dependent version of claim 28. Claims 29-31 should be allowable together with allowable independent claim 27.

Claims 16, 18-22, 24-27 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for alleged anticipation, over US patent no. 5,696,789 to Jones et al. With respect to the rejected claims, it is believed that the rejection is now moot in view of the amendments discussed above to conform 16, 22 and 27 to the subject matter that the Examiner indicated allowable over Jones et al. However, Applicant is also presenting new claims 32-41, and discussions of the new claims and of their patentability over the Jones et al. document follow.

New independent claim 32 requires processing of the header in the received spread-spectrum signal in accord with a common chip sequence signal. Processing to despread the multichannel-spread-spectrum signal uses respective chip sequence signals. As disclosed, the header chip sequence is common across the packet spread-spectrum signal (common across or with respect to the multiple channels), and is processed using a separate matched filter 79. A single chip sequence signal is used to recognize the header, regardless of how many chip sequence signals are used to despread the received spread-spectrum channels. In the disclosed example, the chip sequence signal that the filter 79 applies for header processing is common to all users (see e.g. page 16, lines 18-21 of the specification). By comparison, each of the disclosed data-matched filters 71, 78 has an impulse response matched to a chip-sequence signal of a respective one of the plurality of chip-sequence signals. The data-matched filters 71, 78 despread the multichannel-spread-spectrum signal of the packet-spread-spectrum signal to

produce the plurality of received spread-spectrum channels (see e.g. page 17, lines 5-11 of the specification). In view of the cited disclosure in the application, it is believed that new claim 32 and the claims that depend therefrom are adequately supported in the original specification, and no new matter is added. New claim 38-41 are system claims, but it is believed that the system claims are similarly supported by the above-cited sections of the original application.

It is further submitted that the new claims patentably distinguish of Jones et al. It appears that the applied Jones et al. patent uses only individual or 'respective' chip sequence signals to despread the individual identification codes. As recited in column 12, (lines 20-28) the patent states "Each matched filter correlator will only provide such a trigger signal if it detects the presence of a preamble or header code sequence identifying that channel. Each demodulator mixes or multiplies the corresponding spread code with the signal from automatic level control 26 (if permitted by the corresponding matched filter correlator) to despread that signal and thereby recover the originally applied identification sequence or code." As such, there appears to be no processing of a header with a common chip sequence signal to produce a timing or control signal, as in new independent claim 32. With respect to claim 38, there is no means for processing, which uses a "common chip sequence signal."

It is also respectfully submitted that that the Jones et al. patent does not actually teach multiplexing data obtained from the plurality of received spread-spectrum channels to form a received data output stream. Jones et al. only store the recovered code(s) in memory 30 (see e.g. column 12, lines 29-33). Hence, the Jones et al. patent also fails to meet the multiplexing requirement of the last paragraph of new independent claim 32. In a similar fashion, there is no multiplexer for combining the data from the received spread-spectrum channels into a data output stream.

In view of the noted distinctions, it is respectfully submitted that new independent claims 32 and 38 are patentable over the applied Jones et al. document. Dependent claims 33-37 and 39-41 should be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Upon entry of the above claim amendments, claims 16, 18-22, 24-27 and 29-41 remain active in this application, all of which should be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this case should now be ready to pass to issue; and Applicant respectfully requests a prompt favorable reconsideration of this matter.

It is believed that this response addresses all issues raised in the May 5, 2004 Office Action. However, if any further issue should arise that may be addressed in an interview or obviated by an Examiner's amendment, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Applicant's representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, if any, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Keith E. George
Registration No. 34,111

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
202.756.8000 KEG:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 27, 2004